

U.S. Serial No. 10/675,899  
Response to the Office Action of July 24, 2006

Docket CU-3335

### REMARKS

In the office action mailed July 24, 2006, claims 6 -- 7 and 15 were objected to by the Examiner because of certain informalities. In particular, the Examiner determined that each claim of claims 6 and 7 recited a "second retainer" however, no "first retainer" was explicitly recited in either of these two claims. In response to the Examiner's objection, claims 6 -- 7 and 15 have been amended to change "second retainer" to --first retainer--.

Claim 7 was also objected to because it recited limitation "the connection" in line 3 for which the examiner determined there was no antecedent basis. In response, claim 7 has been amended to overcome the objection.

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC §102 (b) as being anticipated by U. S. patent 5,351,362 two Kramer et al.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 18 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication 2001/0008036, in view of US patent number 2, 668, 9792 MacFarland.

Claims 1, 4-8, and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent number 3, 005, 224 in view of MacFarland.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magarian and MacFarland as applied to claim one, in view of Blase.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Magarian and MacFarland as applied to claim 1, in view of Allgeier.

Claims 9, 13 - 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Magarian in view of MacFarland and Blase.

Claims 10 - 11 were rejected under 35 USC § 10 3(a) as being unpatentable or Magarian, McFarland, and Blase in view of JP 04 - 272734.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC § 10 3(a) as being unpatentable over Magarian, McFarland, and blaze in view of Allgeier.

In response to the Office Action, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the brush body includes a discharge pipe. The discharge portion of the brush body is also recited as having a locking unit that is comprised of a hook member

U.S. Serial No. 10/675,899  
Response to the Office Action of July 24, 2006

Docket CU-3335

and a button. The hook member is capable of engaging a recess and an extension pipe.

The wherein clause of claim 1 has also been amended to correct grammar used therein.

Claims 6 has been amended to recite a "a first retainer" to overcome the Examiner's objection to "second retainer."

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the first and second pulleys are coupled to each other via a belt.

In response to the office action, independent claim 1 has been amended to add a limitation that requires a locking unit attached to a rear portion of the discharge pipe. The locking unit is claimed to comprise a hook member and a button. The hook member is claimed as being capable of engaging a coupling recess in an extension pipe inserted into the discharge pipe, the hook member is disengaged from the coupling recess by the operation of the button.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to recite that the brush body includes a discharge pipe and to recite that the brush body has a hook member and a button. The hook member is claimed as being capable of engaging a coupling recess in an extension pipe. The hook member is disengaged from the coupling recess by operation of the button.

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 9 can be found in the specification on page 13 in lines 9 – 18. No new matter has been added.

The applicant acknowledges that Kramer and McFarland disclose a brush body, an agitator unit, a turbine unit and a power transfer unit and that they also disclose ribs extending across a suction slot. However, neither Kramer, McFarland, Worwag nor Magarian show or suggest the locking unit limitation that has been added to claim 1 and claim 9 by the foregoing amendment. In particular, none of them show a hook member that is capable of engaging a recess in an extension pipe that is inserted into the discharge pipe of the brush body. Stated alternatively, independent claims 1 and 9 avoid the art cited by the Examiner.

U.S. Serial No. 10/675,899  
Response to the Office Action of July 24, 2006


Docket CU-3335

Since the independent claims now avoid the prior art, dependent claims that further narrow the independent claims also avoid the prior art. The applicant therefore requests reconsideration of all of the claims and requests their allowance as soon as possible.

As for the Examiner's objections to claims 6 and 7, they have been overcome by the amendments to those claims as well.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 23, 2006

  
Joseph P. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578  
Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300